A topological view on algebraic computation models

Eike Neumann
Aston University, Birmingham, UK
neumaef1@aston.ac.uk

Arno Pauly
Département d'Informatique
Université libre de Bruxelles, Belgium*
Arno.Pauly@cl.cam.ac.uk

arXiv:1602.08004v1 [cs.LO] 25 Feb 2016

We investigate the topological aspects of some algebraic computation models, in particular the BSS-model. Our results can be seen as bounds on how different BSS-computability and computability in the sense of computable analysis can be. In particular, we establish that the solvability complexity index is (mostly) independent of the computational model, and that there thus is common ground in the study of non-computability between the BSS and TTE setting.

1 Introduction

There are two major paradigms for computability on functions on the real numbers: One the one hand, computable analysis in the tradition of Grzegorczyk [27, 28] and Lacombe [36] as championed by Weihrauch [54, 55] (see also the equivalent approaches by Pour-El and Richards [50] or Ko [35]). On the other hand, the BSS-machines by Blum, Shub and Smale [3, 2], or the very similar real-RAM model. Incidentally, both schools claim to be in the tradition of Turing.

Computable analysis can, to a large extent, be understood as effective topology [21, 45] – this becomes particularly clear when one moves beyond just the real numbers, and is interested in computability on spaces of subsets or functionals. In particular, we find that the effective Borel hierarchy occupies the position analogous to the arithmetical hierarchy in classical recursion theory; and that incomputability of natural problems is typically a consequence of discontinuity. A more fine-grained view becomes possible in the framework of Weihrauch reducibility (more below).

In contrast, the study of BSS-computability is essentially a question akin to (logical) definability in algebraic structures. This causes the lack of a stable notions of BSS-computability on *the reals*: BSS-computability on the ring $(\mathbb{R}, +, \times, =)$ differs from BSS-computability on the unordered field $(\mathbb{R}, +, \times, -, /, =)$, which in turn differs from BSS-computability on the ordered field $(\mathbb{R}, +, \times, -, /, <)$. Taking into account as basic functions further maps such as square root or the exponential function induces additional variants. There, however, also topological obstacles to being BSS-computable – and as we shall demonstrate, these obstacles are common to all variants of BSS-machines.

Hotz and his coauthors [19, 33, 22] have introduced and studied a number of extensions of BSS-machines (called *analytic machines*), which can (in various ways) make use of approximations. These additional features enable the "computation" of even more discontinuous functions, however, there are still topological limitations.

*The majority of this work was done while Pauly was at the Computer Laboratory, University of Cambridge.

In the present article, we characterize the maximal degrees of discontinuity for functions computable by each of the algebraic machine models in the framework of Weihrauch reducibility. We thus continue and extend the work by Gärtner and Ziegler in [23]. This allows us to differentiate between topological and algebraic reasons for non-computability in these models. Moreover, we can show that for sufficiently discontinuous problems the difference between the various computational models vanishes: This can be formalized using Hansen's *solvability complexity index* (SCI) [29, 1], which is the least number of limits one needs to solve a particular problem over some basic computational model. Our results show e.g. that for values of 2 or greater the SCI based on the BSS-model coincides with the SCI based on the computable analysis model.

2 Background on the models and Weihrauch reducibility

2.1 Algebraic computation models

We introduce notion of a register machine over some algebraic structure, following e.g. Tucker and Zucker (2000) [53] and Tavana and Weihrauch (2011) [52]. For this consider some algebraic structure $\mathfrak{A} = (A, f_1, f_2, \ldots, T_1, T_2, \ldots)$, where A is a set, each f_i is a function of type $f_i : A^{k_i} \to A$, and each T_i is a relation of type $T_i \subseteq A^{l_i}$. Both functions and tests could in principle be partial. In the usual examples, the signatures will be finite, but this is not essential for our considerations.

Generalized register machines will compute functions of type $g : A^* \to A^*$. They have registers $(R_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ holding elements of A, and index registers $(I_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ holding natural numbers. Programs are finite lists of commands, consisting of:

- standard register machine operations on the index registers
- copying the value the register R_{I_1} indexed by I_1 into R_{I_0}
- applying some f_i on the values contained in $R_1, \ldots, R_{k_i}$ and writing the result into R_0
- branching to a line in the program depending on the value of T_i on the values contained in $R_1, \ldots, R_{l_i}$
- HALT, in which case the values currently in the registers $R_0, \ldots, R_{I_0}$ constitute the output

Initially, the register I_0 contains the length of the input, all other I_n start at 0. The input is in $R_1, \ldots, R_n$, all other R_i contain some fixed value $a_0 \in A$. If the program either fails to halt on some input, or invokes a partial function or a partial test on some values outside its domain, the computed function is undefined on these values. We call a (partial) function $g : A^* \to A^*$ $\mathfrak{A}$-computable, if there is a generalized register machine program computing it.

In analogy to the situation in computable analysis, we shall call sections of $\mathfrak{A}$-computable function $\mathfrak{A}$-continuous. This boils down to programs being allowed additional assignment operations $R_i := a$ for any element $a \in A$. These are usually included in the algebraic models, but have the undesirable consequence of there being more than countably many programs, if A itself is uncountable. By padding the length of the input in a suitable way, and exploiting the ability to compute on index registers, we see that that there is a universal machine for all the $\mathfrak{A}$-continuous functions.

The primary example of a structure will be $(\mathbb{R}, +, \times, <)$ (yielding BSS-computability). Secondary examples include $(\mathbb{R}, +, =)$ (additive machines with equality) and other combinations of continuous functions and tests in $\{=, <\}$.

2.2 Analytic machines

The analytic machines introduced in [19, 33] enhance BSS-machines by means to approximate functions. More generally, if we consider the algebraic structure $\mathfrak{A}$ to also carry a metric, we can define strongly $\mathfrak{A}$-analytic and weakly $\mathfrak{A}$-analytic functions in one of two equivalent ways: Either a generalized register machine receives an additional input $n \in \mathbb{N}$; thus computes a function $G :\subseteq \mathbb{N} \times A^* \to A^*$, which is then considered as weakly approximating $g :\subseteq A^* \to A^*$ iff $\forall \mathbf{a} \in \mathrm{dom}(g)\ \lim_{n\to\infty} G(n, \mathbf{a}) = g(a)$, and as strongly approximating g iff $\forall \mathbf{a} \in \mathrm{dom}(g)\ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}\ d(G(n, \mathbf{a}), g(a)) < 2^{-n}$. Alternatively there is no extra input, and the machine keeps running, and produces an infinite sequence $p \in A^\omega$ (plus some information on the length of the desired output). The limit conditions are the same.

We shall speak just of "functions computable by a strongly (weakly) analytic machine" if the underlying structure is $(\mathbb{R}, +, \times, <)$. As functions computable by an analytic machine receive their input exactly, but produce their output in an approximative fashion, they are generally not closed under composition.

Further variants of analytic machines have been considered, which are not relevant for the present paper though. We refer to [56] by Ziegler for an excellent discussion.

2.3 Type-2 Turing machines

The fundamental model for computable analysis/the TTE-framework [55] are the Type-2 Turing machines. Structurally, these do not differ from ordinary Turing machines with a designated write-once only output tape. What differs is that instead of the machine halting and thus produces a finite output, the machine continues to run for ever. As long as it keeps writing on the output tape, this produces an infinite sequence in the limit. While some might object to the use of infinitely long computations, this model is realistic in as far as anything written on the output tape at some finite time constitutes a prefix to the infinite output (as each cell in the output tape can be changed just once). Thus, this model inherently captures approximating computations – and its intricate connection to topology is perhaps unsurprising. In particular, we find that any computable function is automatically continuous w.r.t. the standard topology on $\{0,1\}^\mathbb{N}$ – and vice versa, every continuous function becomes computable relative to some oracle.

Type-2 machines natively provide us with a notion of computability on $\{0,1\}^\mathbb{N}$. This is then transferred to the spaces of actual interest by means of a representation. A *represented space* is a pair $\mathbf{X} = (X, \delta_X)$ of a set X and a partial surjection $\delta_X :\subseteq \{0,1\}^\mathbb{N} \to X$. A (multi-valued) function between represented spaces is a (multi-valued) function between the underlying sets. For $f :\subseteq \mathbf{X} \rightrightarrows \mathbf{Y}$ and $F :\subseteq \{0,1\}^\mathbb{N} \to \{0,1\}^\mathbb{N}$, we call F a realizer of f (notation $F \vdash f$), iff $\delta_Y(F(p)) \in f(\delta_X(p))$ for all $p \in \mathrm{dom}(f\delta_X)$. A map between represented spaces is called computable (continuous), iff it has a computable (continuous) realizer.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \{0,1\}^\mathbb{N} & \xrightarrow{F} & \{0,1\}^\mathbb{N} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \delta_\mathbf{X}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \delta_\mathbf{Y}} \\ \mathbf{X} & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathbf{Y} \end{array}$$

Figure 1: The notion of a realizer

As we are primarily interested in computability on $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{R}^*$, we shall introduce the standard representations for these spaces. Fix some standard enumeration $\nu_{\mathbb{Q}} : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{Q}$. Then let $\rho(p) = x$ if $p = 0^{n_0}10^{n_1}1\ldots$ and $\forall i \in \mathbb{N}\ \ d(x, \nu_{\mathbb{Q}}(n_i)) < 2^{-i}$. In other words, a name for a real number is a sequence of rationals converging to it with some prescribed speed. We thus understand $\mathbb{R}$ to be the represented space $(\mathbb{R}, \rho)$. As we can form products and coproducts of represented spaces, we automatically obtain a representation for $\mathbb{R}^* = \coprod_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{R}^n$.

2.4 Weihrauch reducibility

Weihrauch reducibility is a preorder on multivalued functions between represented spaces, and serves as a framework for comparing incomputability in the Type-2 setting, similar to the role of many-one or Turing reductions in classical recursion theory:

Definition 1 (Weihrauch reducibility)**.** Let f, g be multi-valued functions on represented spaces. Then f is said to be *Weihrauch reducible* to g, in symbols $f \leq_{\mathrm{W}} g$, if there are computable functions $K, H :\subseteq \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $K\langle \mathrm{id}, GH\rangle \vdash f$ for all $G \vdash g$. Accordingly, f is said to be *continuously Weihrauch reducible* to g, in symbols $f \leq^{c}_{\mathrm{W}} g$, if there exist continuous functions K and H satisfying this condition.

The relation $\leq_{\mathrm{W}}$ is reflexive and transitive. We use $\equiv_{\mathrm{W}}$ to denote equivalence regarding $\leq_{\mathrm{W}}$, and by $<_{\mathrm{W}}$ we denote strict reducibility. By $\mathfrak{W}$ we refer to the partially ordered set of equivalence classes. As shown in [43, 8], $\mathfrak{W}$ is a distributive lattice, and also the usual product operation on multivalued function induces an operation $\times$ on $\mathfrak{W}$. The algebraic structure on $\mathfrak{W}$ has been investigated in further detail in [31, 13].

There are two relevant unary operations defined on $\mathfrak{W}$, both happen to be closure operators. The operation * was introduced in [43, 42] by setting $f^0 := \mathrm{id}^{\mathbb{N}}_{\mathbb{N}}$, $f^{n+1} := f \times f^n$ and then $f^*(n, x) := f^n(x)$. It corresponds to making any finite number of parallel uses of f available. Similarly, the *parallelization* operation $\widehat{\ }$ from [8, 7] makes countably many parallel uses available by $\widehat{f}(x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots) := (f(x_0), f(x_1), f(x_2), \ldots)$.

We will make use of an operation $\star$ defined on $\mathfrak{W}$ that captures aspects of function composition. Following [10, 12], let $f \star g := \max_{\leq_{\mathrm{W}}}\{f_0 \circ g_0 \mid f \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} f_0 \wedge g \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} g_0\}$. We understand that the quantification is running over all suitable functions f_0, g_0 with matching types for the function composition. It is not obvious that this maximum always exists, this is shown in [13] using an explicit construction for $f \star g$. Like function composition, $\star$ is associative but generally not commutative. We use $\star$ to introduce iterated composition by setting $f^{(0)} := \mathrm{id}^{\mathbb{N}}_{\mathbb{N}}$ and $f^{(n+1)} = f^{(n)} \star f$.

All computable multivalued functions with a computable point in their domain are Weihrauch equivalent, this degree is denoted by 1.

An important source for examples of Weihrauch degrees that are relevant for the classification of theorems are the closed choice principles studied in e.g. [7, 6]:

Definition 2. Given a represented space $\mathbf{X}$, the associated closed choice principle $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbf{X}}$ is the partial multivalued function $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbf{X}} :\subseteq \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) \rightrightarrows \mathbf{X}$ mapping a non-empty closed set to an arbitrary point in it.

The Weihrauch degree corresponding to $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ has received significant attention, e.g. in [7, 6, 40, 38, 39, 9, 41, 47, 48]. In particular, as shown in [46], a function between computable Polish spaces is Weihrauch reducible to $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ iff it is piecewise computable iff it is effectively Δ^0_2-measurable.

The second standard Weihrauch degree very relevant for our investigation will be lim, with its representative $\lim :\subseteq \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ defined via $\lim(p)(n) = \lim_{i\to\infty} p(\langle n, i\rangle)$. It was shown in [5] that lim is Weihrauch-complete for Σ^0_2-measurable functions, and that, more generally, $\lim^{(n)}$ is Weihrauch-complete for Σ^0_{n+1}-measurable function. This line of research was continued in [32].

For our purposes, the following representatives and properties of the degree $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ are also relevant:

Lemma 3 ([47])**.** The following are Weihrauch equivalent:

1. $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$, that is closed choice on the natural numbers.
2. $\mathrm{UC}_{\mathbb{N}}$, defined via $\mathrm{UC}_{\mathbb{N}} = (\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}})\,|_{\{A\in\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{N})||A|=1\}}$.
3. $\min :\subseteq \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{N}) \to \mathbb{N}$ defined on the non-empty closed subsets of $\mathbb{N}$.
4. $\max :\subseteq \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{N}) \to \mathbb{N}$ defined on the bounded open subsets of $\mathbb{N}$.
5. $\max :\subseteq \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{N}$ defined by $\max(p) = \max\{p(i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$.
6. $\mathrm{Bound} :\subseteq \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{N}) \rightrightarrows \mathbb{N}$, where $n \in \mathrm{Bound}(U)$ iff $\forall m \in U\ n \geq m$.

Lemma 4 ([10])**.** The following are Weihrauch equivalent:

1. $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$
2. $\lim_\Delta :\subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{R}$, where $\lim_\Delta$ maps an eventually constant sequence to its limit

Lemma 5 ([40])**.** For $f : \mathbf{X} \to \{0, \ldots, n\}$ we have $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \not\leq_{\mathrm{W}} f$.

Lemma 6 ([6])**.** 1. $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \star \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$

2. $\lim \star \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \lim$

2.5 On the difference between algebraic and topological models of computation

Penrose [49] posed and made popular the question whether the Mandelbrot set is computable – albeit without specifying any formal definition of *computable* for this question. In the BSS-model, a negative answer was readily obtained in [2]. Brattka [4], however, argued that this result just reflects that the Mandelbrot set is not an algebraic object, without being meaningful for computability as naively understood: A very similar proof applies also to the epigraph of the exponential function – which, as many[1] would agree, *ought* to be computable.([2])

The usual focal point for disagreement between the two communities, however, is not about functions computable in the Type-2 sense but non-computable in the BSS-sense, but vice versa. As is commonly understood, and will be proven formally below, this boils down to equality (or any other non-trivial property of real numbers) being decidable in the BSS-model. Brattka and Hertling [11] proposed the *feasible real RAM*'s, a variation on the BSS-model that rather than deterministic tests can only perform non-deterministic tests that may give a wrong answer for very close numbers. The functions approximable by a feasible real RAM are precisely those computable in the Type-2 sense; i.e. allowing approximation and removing exact tests is precisely what is needed to move from BSS-computability to Type-2 computability.

[1] Including Penrose himself, see e.g. [49, Figure 4.5, p. 167].

[2] The question whether the (distance function of the) Mandelbrot set is computable in the computable analysis sense is still open – as shown by Hertling [30], this would be implied by the hyperbolicity conjecture. See the book [14] for a general discussion of Julia sets and computability.

3 The complexity of finitely many tests

As explained above, the crucial distinguishing feature giving the algebraic computation models addition power is the ability to make finitely many tests, usually either equality or order. Both examples are Weihrauch equivalent to LPO. Thus we are lead to the problem of classifying the computational power inherent in being allowed to make finitely many uses of LPO. Note that we are not required to state any bounds in advance (which would just yield LPO^*), but simply have to cease making additional queries to LPO eventually.

We can formalize this using the generalized register machines: We allow all computable function as functions, and LPO as test[3]. We shall write $\mathrm{LPO}^\diamond$ for the universal problem for this type of machines:

Proposition 7. $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{LPO}^\diamond$.

Proof. $\max \leq_{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{LPO}^\diamond$ We describe a generalized register machine program using computable functions and LPO that solves max. Given $p \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we can compute some $p_n \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $p_n \neq 0^{\mathbb{N}} \Leftrightarrow \exists i \in \mathbb{N} p(i) > n$. Starting with $i = 0$, we simply test $\mathrm{LPO}(p_i)$. If yes, we output i and terminate. Else we continue with $i := i + 1$.

$\mathbf{LPO}^\diamond \leq_{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ The register machine has at most countably many computation paths, and we can number these effectively. Each computation path uses LPO only finitely many times, and we can so additionally pick a cut-off number $c \in \mathbb{N}$ of each no-choice along a path, and code all of this into a single natural number n.

Given a natural number n (coding a computation path and cutoff-numbers), we can check whether this computation path is indeed feasible: If we either find that an input to a test is non-zero but the path branches to yes, or that the path branches to no, but at the precision specified by the cut-off number, we have not seen proof of this, this number is rejected. Note that for this it is relevant that LPO is pre-complete. We can then use $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ to pick a number which is never rejected, which then allows us to simulate the computation of the register machine in an otherwise computable fashion.

□

On a side note, let us consider two more computational models: First, the concept of finitely revising computation presented in [58] by Ziegler: These are Type-2 machines equipped with the additional power to reset their output finitely many times. It is easy to see that being computable by a finitely revising machine is equivalent to being Weihrauch-reducible to $\lim_\Delta$. Second, non-deterministic Type-2 computation, also introduced by Ziegler [57] and fleshed out further by Brattka, de Brecht and P.in [6]: Here the machine may guess an element of an advice space, and either proceed to successfully compute a solution, or reject the guess at a finite stage (and there must be a chance of the former). As shown in [6], being computable by a non-deterministic machine with advice space $\mathbf{Z}$ is equivalent to being Weihrauch reducible to $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbf{Z}}$. We thus arrive at the following:

Theorem 8. The following computational models are equivalent:

1. Generalized register machines with computable functions and LPO as test.
2. Finitely revising machines.

[3] Alternatively, we could have used the rather cumbersome Oracle-Type-Two machines suggested in [41].

3. Non-deterministic machines with advice space $\mathbb{N}$.

So far we have only obtained an upper bound for the power of BSS-machines in the Weihrauch lattice. For a lower bound, we require some further representatives of the Weihrauch degree of $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$. Some of the following have already been shown in [38, 40].

Proposition 9. The following are Weihrauch equivalent:

1. $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$.
2. $\max :\subseteq \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{N}$
3. $\mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{e,d} : \mathbb{Q}_e \to \mathbb{Q}_d$, where $\mathbb{Q}_e$ are the rationals with the Euclidean topology, and $\mathbb{Q}_d$ are the rationals with the discrete topology.
4. Numerator : $\mathbb{Q}_e \to \mathbb{N}$, where $\mathrm{Numerator}(q) = n$ iff $\exists m \in \mathbb{N}\ \gcd(n, m) = 1$ and $q = \frac{n}{m}$.
5. Denominator : $\mathbb{Q}_e \rightrightarrows \mathbb{N}$, where $\mathrm{Denominator}(q) = m$ iff $\exists n \in \mathbb{N}\ \gcd(n, m) = 1$ and $q = \frac{n}{m}$.([4])

Proof. $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \leq_{\mathbf{W}} \max$ Lemma 3.

$\max \leq_{\mathbf{W}}$ Denominator W.l.o.g., assume that the input p to max is monotone and that $p(0) = 0$. We proceed to compute a real number x which will happen to be rational (i.e. we compute x as an element of $\mathbb{Q}_e$). Our initial approximation to x is $x_0 = 0$. If $p(n+1) = p(n)$, then $x_{n+1} = x_n$. If $p(n+1) > p(n)$, then we search for some $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d\left(\frac{2l+1}{2^{\langle k, p(n+1)\rangle}}, x_n\right) < 2^{-n-1}$ – which are guaranteed to exist. Then we set $x_{n+1} = \frac{2l+1}{2^{\langle k, p(n+1)\rangle}}$. As the range of p is finite, this sequence will stabilize eventually, and by constructing, converges quickly to its rational limit.

Applying Denominator to x will give us some $2^{\langle k, \max(p)\rangle} \in \mathbb{N}$. By design of $\langle\ ,\ \rangle$, we can extract $\max(p)$ from this value.

$\max \leq_{\mathbf{W}}$ Numerator Very similar to the reduction $\max \leq_{\mathrm{W}}$ Denominator. On monotone input p with $p(0) = 0$, we start with the approximation $x_0 = 1$. If $p(n+1) = p(n)$, then $x_{n+1} = x_n$. Otherwise, we search for $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d\left(\frac{2^{\langle p(n+1), k\rangle}}{2l+1}, x_n\right) < 2^{-n-1}$, and set $x_{n+1} := \frac{2^{\langle p(n+1), k\rangle}}{2l+1}$ for these values. As the range of p is finite, this sequence will stabilize eventually, and by constructing, converges quickly to its rational limit x.

Applying Numerator to x will give us some $2^{\langle k, \max(p)\rangle} \in \mathbb{N}$. By design of $\langle\ ,\ \rangle$, we can extract $\max(p)$ from this value.

Denominator $\leq_{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{id}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{e,d}$ Trivial.

Numerator $\leq_{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{id}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{e,d}$ Trivial.

$\mathbf{id}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{e,d} \leq_{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ Given $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we can compute $\{\langle n, m\rangle \in \mathbb{N} \mid mx = n\} \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{N})$. If $x \in \mathbb{Q}_e$ this set is non-empty, so we can use $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ to extract an element, which allows us to obtain $x \in \mathbb{Q}_d$. □

Proposition 10. $\mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{e,d}$ is computable by a machine over $(\mathbb{R}, +, =, 1)$.

[4]This map is multivalued, as any positive integer is a valid output on input 0. Restricting the map to non-zero inputs does not change the Weihrauch degree.

Proof. Let x be the input. For each $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, we can compute nx and m by repeated addition, and then test them for equality. If they are equal, then we found a valid output in the pair (n, m), if not, we consider the next pair. □

Corollary 11. For every algebraic computation model extending $(\mathbb{R}, +, =, 1)$ not exceeding the continuous functions and $\{=, <\}$ as tests, we find that:

- Every function computable in that model is Weihrauch reducible to $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$.
- There is a (partial) function computable in that model that is Weihrauch equivalent to $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$.

Thus, the computational power of algebraic computation models is, from the perspective of topological computation models, characterized by the Weihrauch degree of $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$.

It should be pointed out though that this characterization relies crucially on considering partial functions, too. By the Hausdorff-Kuratowski theorem [15, 44], any total function $f : \mathbb{R}^* \to \mathbb{R}^*$ with $f \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ is strictly below $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ – in fact, there is some countable ordinal α with $f \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathfrak{L}_\alpha$. Here, $\mathfrak{L}_\alpha$ is defined as follows: Let $R \subseteq \mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{N}$ be a partial order of height α. A sequence $(n_i, x_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ where $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x_i \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is in the domain of $\mathfrak{L}_\alpha$, if $x_i \neq x_{i+1} \Rightarrow (n_{i+1}, n_i) \in R$ and $x_i = x_{i+1} \Rightarrow n_i = n_{i+1}$. As R is well-founded, these conditions imply that the sequence stabilizes eventually, and $\mathfrak{L}_\alpha$ returns the corresponding limit x_∞. Thus we find $\mathfrak{L}_\alpha \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \lim_\Delta \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$. As shown in [15, 30], if $\alpha < \beta$, then $\mathfrak{L}_\alpha <_W \mathfrak{L}_\beta$. Furthermore, we find that $\mathfrak{L}_\omega \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{LPO}^*$.

Corollary 12. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^* \to \mathbb{R}^*$ be a total BSS-computable function. Then there is some countable ordinal α with $f \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathfrak{L}_\alpha$.

Proposition 13. For each countable successor ordinal $\alpha + 1$ there is some BSS-computable total function $f_{\alpha+1} : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{N}$ with $f_{\alpha+1} \geq^c_{\mathrm{W}} \mathfrak{L}_{\alpha+1}$.

Proof. We proceed by induction over $\alpha + 1$. The claim for $\alpha = 0$ is establishes by LPO. It suffices to show that if the claim is true (uniformly) for $(\alpha_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $\alpha_i \leq \alpha_{i+1}$, then it is true for $(\sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \alpha_i) + 1$.

We define $f_{\alpha+1} : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{N}$ piecewise. If $x \in [\frac{1}{2i+1}, \frac{1}{2i}]$ for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$, then $f_{\alpha+1}(x) := \langle i + 1, f_{\alpha_i+1}(2i(2i + 1)x - 2i)\rangle$. Otherwise, $f_{\alpha+1} := \langle 0, 0\rangle$. If the f_{α_i+1} are either uniformly (in i) BSS-computable, or, alternatively, coded into a real parameter, this clearly yields a BSS-computable function.

Claim: $\mathfrak{L}_{\alpha+1} \leq^c_{\mathbf{W}} f_{\alpha+1}$

We start writing a name for $x := 0$ while reading the input to $\mathfrak{L}_{\alpha+1}$. If the first parameter ever changes, then it will move to some n_i such that the lower cone of n_i has some height $\alpha' + 1 \leq \alpha$. In particular, there must be some $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\alpha' + 1 \leq \alpha_j + 1$. The suitable pairs (i, j) can be coded into a single real parameter. There will be some $k \geq j$ such that $[\frac{1}{2k+1}, \frac{1}{2k}]$ is still within the scope of the current approximation to 0.

The tail of the input to $\mathfrak{L}_{\alpha+1}$ at the current moment is now also a valid input to $\mathfrak{L}_{\alpha_k+1}$. Thus, we can continue to use the reduction $\mathfrak{L}_{\alpha_k+1} \leq^c_{\mathrm{W}} f_{\alpha_k+1}$, with f_{α_k+1} scaled down into the interval $[\frac{1}{2k+1}, \frac{1}{2k}]$.

To interpret the output of $f_{\alpha+1}$, the only difference is whether it is of the form $\langle 0, 0\rangle$ or $\langle i + 1, n\rangle$. In the former case, the input sequence to $\mathfrak{L}_{\alpha+1}$ is constant, and we just read off the answer. In the latter case, there is at least one change – so we can search for it, and then split $n := \langle i', n'\rangle$ to see whether there is a further change, and so on.

□

If we consider total functions, and drop the order test from the signature, the maximum Weihrauch degree reachable is even lower:

Proposition 14. If $f : \mathbb{R}^* \to \mathbb{R}^*$ is BSS-computable over $(\mathbb{R}, +, \times, =)$, then $f \leq^c_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{LPO}^*$. There is a function $g : \mathbb{R}^* \to \mathbb{R}^*$ that is BSS-computable over $(\mathbb{R}, +, \times, =)$ and satisfies $g \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{LPO}^*$.

Proof. Let us consider the computation tree of f on some dimension $\mathbb{R}^n$. Each leaf is associated with a boolean combination of algebraic sets, and different leaves are associated with disjoint such combinations. As f is total, we just obtain a partition of $\mathbb{R}^n$ into boolean combinations of algebraic sets. As the Zariski topology of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is Noetherian and sober, it follows that there are only finitely many parts, i.e. the computation tree itself is finite. Thus, we can bound the number of equality tests we need to do based on the dimension only – but that just establishes $f \leq^c_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{LPO}^*$.

For the example g, consider the function $g : \mathbb{R}^* \to \mathbb{N}$ mapping $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ to $|\{i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \mid x_i = 0\}|$. This function is obviously BSS-computable over $(\mathbb{R}, +, \times, =)$, and easily seen to be Weihrauch-equivalent to LPO^*. □

4 On the BSS-Halting problems

Very much in analogy to the (classical) Halting problem and the investigation of the Turing degrees below it (Post's problem), the BSS-Halting problems are easily seen to be undecidable by the corresponding BSS-machines, and there are rich hierarchies to be found below them [37, 24]. Very much unlike the classical setting, there is a natural undecidable set strictly below the Halting problem, namely $\mathbb{Q}$.

Let $\mathbb{H}$ be the Halting problem for BSS-machines having access to $+$, $=$, and potentially additional continuous operations and/or $<$ as test. Let $\chi_{\mathbb{Q}}$ be the characteristic function of $\mathbb{Q}$ (into the discrete space $\{0, 1\}$), and $\chi_{\mathbb{H}}$ be the characteristic function of $\mathbb{H}$. Finally, let $\mathrm{isInfinite} : \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \{0, 1\}$ be defined via $\mathrm{isInfinite}(p) = 1$ iff $|\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid p(n) = 1\}| = \infty$.

Theorem 15. The following are Weihrauch-equivalent:

1. $\chi_{\mathbb{Q}}$
2. $\chi_{\mathbb{H}}$
3. isInfinite

Proof. $\chi_{\mathbb{Q}} \leq_{\mathbf{W}} \chi_{\mathbb{H}}$ We just combine the original input with the program for $\mathrm{id}^{e,d}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ from Proposition 10. This will halt iff the input is rational.

$\chi_{\mathbb{H}} \leq_{\mathbf{W}}$ **isInfinite** A Type-2 Machine can attempt to simulate a BSS-machine by assuming that any test for equality yields *true* unless a contradiction is found within some precision parameter n. Now we keep writing 0's, while writing the n-th 1 on the output tape once the simulation of the input BSS-machine with some precision parameter $N \geq n$ has been run for n steps without halting. We claim that we will write infinitely many 1s iff the input BSS-machine does not halt – thus flipping the output from isInfinite suffices to complete the reduction.

Let us assume that the input BSS-machine halts on its input. Then it does so after some number k of steps. As it can have made at most k tests, there will be some $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that any pair of real numbers compared is either equal or more than 2^{-j} apart. Thus,

simulating the machine with precision parameter $n \geq j$ will yield the correct run, in particular will halt after k steps. Thus, our simulating Type-2 machine will never write more then $\max\{j,k\}$ many 1s.

Conversely, let us assume that the simulating Type-2 machine is writing only N 1s. This means that simulating the BSS-machine with precision parameter $n > N$ cannot cause it to do more than N steps. If the true run, however, would be infinite, then in particular it will do the $N+1$st step. At this step, only finitely many tests have been made, thus, as above there is precision parameter $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ensuring these tests are all simulated correctly. But now, the simulation of the BSS-machine with $\max\{j, N+1\}$ precision parameter will cause the $N+1$st 1 to be written, contradicting our assumption.

isInfinite $\leq_{\mathbf{W}} \chi_{\mathbb{Q}}$ Compute the real number with the decimal expansion

$$0.a_1 0 a_2 00 a_3 000 a_4 0000 \ldots$$

where a_i is the ith bit of the input. This number is rational, i.e. has a periodic decimal expansion, if and only if the a_i are eventually 0.

□

This shows that the role of (local) cardinality for BSS-reducibility demonstrated in [18] depends on the set of operations available in the reduction. Further, note that isInfinite $\not\leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ is easily seen, thus, the inability of BSS-machines to decide their Halting problem already holds for topological reasons (in particular, adding more continuous operations never allows a machine to solve a more restricted Halting problem).

As a side note, we shall point out that isInfinite also is the degree of deciding whether a Type-2 computable function is well-defined on some particular input:

Proposition 16. Let isDefined : $\mathbb{N} \times \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \{0,1\}$ be defined via isDefined$(n,p) = 1$ iff the n-th Type-2 machine produces some $q \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ on input p. Then:

$$\text{isDefined} \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \text{isInfinite}$$

Proof. Let s be an index for the Type-2 machine that copies each 1 from the input to the output, and skips all 0s. Then isInfinite(p) = isDefined(n,p).

For the other direction, note that we can simulate the n-th Type-2 machine while writing 0s. Whenever the machine outputs something, we write a 1. Applying isInfinite to the output produces an answer for isDefined. □

5 The Weihrauch degree of sorting and other problems

In this section we will investigate some Weihrauch degrees, in particular the degree of sorting some $p \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ by order. This degree will turn out to be crucial in characterizing the power of strongly analytic machines later.

Let $\mathfrak{a} = (a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a computable, infinite, repetition-free and dense sequence in the complete computable metric space $\mathbf{X}$. Let $\mathrm{Type}_{\mathfrak{a}} : \mathbf{X} \to [0,1]$ be defined via $\mathrm{Type}_{\mathfrak{a}}(a_n) = 2^{-n}$ and $\mathrm{Type}_{\mathfrak{a}}(x) = 0$ if $x \notin \mathrm{range}(\mathfrak{a})$.

Let Sort : $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be defined via Sort$(p) = 0^n 1^\omega$ iff p contains exactly n times the bit 0, and Sort$(p) = 0^\omega$ iff p contains infinitely many 0s.

Theorem 17. Sort $\equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{Type}_{\mathfrak{a}}$ for any $\mathfrak{a}$.

Proof. $\mathrm{Type}_{\mathfrak{a}} \leq_{\mathrm{sW}} \mathrm{Sort}$

Let x be the input to $\mathrm{Type}_{\mathfrak{a}}$. Start testing if $x = a_0$. While this is possible, write 1's on the input to Sort. If $x \neq a_0$ is ever proven, write a single 0 and proceed to test if $x = a_1$ instead, while again writing 1's. Repeat indefinitely. The outer reduction witness is given by computable $K :\subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to [0,1]$ with $K(0^n 1^\omega) = 2^{-n}$ and $K(0^\omega) = 0$.

$\mathrm{Sort} \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{Type}_{\mathfrak{a}}$

As long as we find only 1's in the input to Sort, start writing a_0 as the input x to $\mathrm{Type}_{\mathfrak{a}}$. If a 0 is read (at time t), we have specified x by fixing $x \in B(a_0, 2^{-t})$. As the $(a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are dense, we can compute an injective function $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that $(a_{f(n)})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ ranges over all a_n in $x \in B(a_0, 2^{-t})$ (and we may assume that $f(0) = 0$). We proceed to write approximations to $a_{f(1)}$ while we read 1's on the input to Sort. If the next 0 is read, we again compute a suitable subsequence and switch our approximations to the next element, and so on.

Given the output of $\mathrm{Type}_{\mathfrak{a}}$, we can start by deciding whether it is 1 or not. If it is 1, the output to sort must be 1^ω. If not, then the input to Sort must contain some 0, and we can search until we find the first one at position t. Knowing t means we can recover the computable function f constructed in the inner reduction witness. Then we test whether the output of $\mathrm{Type}_{\mathfrak{a}}$ is $2^{-f(1)}$. If so, the output to Sort is 01^ω. If not, there is a second 0 somewhere in the input at time t', etc. □

We next wish to show that $\mathrm{Sort} <_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{Sort}^2 <_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{Sort}^3 <_{\mathrm{W}} \ldots$. For this, we need a slight generalization of the Squashing Theorem from [20] (cf. the development in [51]). Rather than using the notion of a finitely-tolerant function as employed there, we generalize this to weakly finitely-tolerant functions. The proof remains unaffected by this, though.

Definition 18. Call $f : \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightrightarrows \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ weakly finitely-tolerant, if there is a computable function A such that for any $\lambda, \lambda' \in \mathbb{N}^*$, if $q \in f(\lambda p)$, then $A(q, \lambda, \lambda') \in f(\lambda' p)$.

Theorem 19 (Squashing Theorem [20])**.** If $f : \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightrightarrows \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is weakly finitely tolerant and $f \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} f \times f$, then $f \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \widehat{f}$.

Corollary 20. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathrm{Sort}^n <_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{Sort}^{n+1}$.

Proof. It is easy to see that any Sort^i is weakly finitely tolerant. Thus, if the claim were false, the Squashing Theorem would imply $\mathrm{Sort}^i \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \widehat{\mathrm{Sort}} \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \lim$, but the left-hand side is non-uniformly computable and the right-hand side is not. □

Let $\mathrm{isFinite}_{\mathbb{S}} : \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{S}$ be defined via $\mathrm{isFinite}_{\mathbb{S}}(p) = \top$ iff p contains finitely many 1s. Let $\mathrm{isInfinite}_{\mathbb{S}} : \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{S}$ be defined via $\mathrm{isInfinite}_{\mathbb{S}}(p) = \top$ iff p contains infinitely many 1s. Let $\mathrm{TC}_{\mathbb{N}} : \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{N}) \rightrightarrows \mathbb{N}$ be the total continuation of $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$, i.e. $p \in \mathrm{TC}_{\mathbb{N}}(A)$ iff $p \in A \vee A = \emptyset$.

Proposition 21.

1. $\mathrm{isInfinite}_{\mathbb{S}} <_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{TC}_{\mathbb{N}}$
2. $\mathrm{isFinite}_{\mathbb{S}} <_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{Sort}$
3. $\mathrm{isInfinite}_{\mathbb{S}} \not\leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{Sort}$
4. $\mathrm{isFinite}_{\mathbb{S}} \not\leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{TC}_{\mathbb{N}}$

Proof.

1. Given $p \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, we can compute $\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid p \text{ contains no more than } n \text{ 1 s}\} \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{N})$. Apply $\mathrm{TC}_{\mathbb{N}}$ to obtain some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Now read p while writing 0s. If ever the m-th 1 in p is found, then the input to $\mathrm{TC}_{\mathbb{N}}$ must have been the empty set, i.e. p must contain infinitely many 1s. Switching the output to writing 1s from then on causes the output to be correct.

   That the reduction is strict follows from the fact that $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{TC}_{\mathbb{N}}$, whereas $\mathrm{isInfinite}_{\mathbb{S}}$ has a codomain with just 2 elements.

2. Let $S : \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be the map that swaps 0s and 1s. Then $\mathrm{isFinite}_{\mathbb{S}}(p) = \delta_{\mathbb{S}} \circ S \circ \mathrm{Sort} \circ S$.

   As above, that the reduction is strict follows from the fact that $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{Sort}$, whereas $\mathrm{isFinite}_{\mathbb{S}}$ has a codomain with just 2 elements.

3. As $\mathrm{Sort} \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \lim$, we find that Sort is Σ^0_2-measurable, and so is every function reducible to it. But $\mathrm{isInfinite}_{\mathbb{S}}^{-1}(\{\top\})$ is a Π^0_2-complete set.

4. Assume that $\mathrm{isFinite}_{\mathbb{S}} \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{TC}_{\mathbb{N}}$ via some witnesses $K :\subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{S}$, $H : \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{N})$. As $\mathbb{S}$ is precomplete, we can assume K to be total. We may understand H instead to be of type $H : \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ using the representation $\psi_- : \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{N})$ where $\psi_-(p) = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \forall i \in \mathbb{N} p(i) \neq n+1\}$. Finally, the latter form of H is obtained as the limit of some suitable computable $h : \{0,1\}^* \to \mathbb{N}^*$.

   As $\mathrm{isFinite}_{\mathbb{S}}(0^{\mathbb{N}}) = \top$, there have to be $l_0, k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $K(0^{l_0}\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}, k) = \top$. As $\mathrm{isFinite}_{\mathbb{S}}(0^{l_0}1^{\mathbb{N}}) = \bot$, there has to be some $l_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $h(0^{l_0}1^{l_1}) = k+1$.

   Now we proceed in stages $i \in \mathbb{N}$, each associated with some current prefix $p_i \in \{0,1\}^*$. We start with $i = 0$ and $p_0 = 0^{l_0}1^{l_1}$. In stage i, consider $K(p_i 0^{\mathbb{N}}, i)$. If this is $\bot$, then we must have $i \notin H(p_i 0^{\mathbb{N}})$ (otherwise the reduction could answer $\bot$ wrongly), so there is some j such that $h(p_i 0^j) = i+1$. We set $p_{i+1} := p_i 0^j 1$ and continue with the next stage. If $K(p_i 0^{\mathbb{N}}, i) = \top$, then this is already determined by some finite prefix $p_i 0^j$. Hence, we must have that $i \notin H(p_i 0^j 1^{\mathbb{N}})$ (otherwise the reduction could answer $\top$ wrongly), so there is some m with $h(p_i 0^j 1^m) = i+1$. We set $p_{i+1} := p_i 0^j 1^m 1$ and continue with the next stage.

   We find that $p = \lim_{i\to\infty} p_i \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is well-defined, contains infinitely many 1s and satisfies that $H(p) = \emptyset$. Thus, $\mathrm{TC}_{\mathbb{N}}$ may answer anything on input $H(p)$, in particular it may answer k. But $K(p,k) = \top$, so the reduction fails.

□

Proposition 22. $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} <_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{Sort} <_{\mathrm{W}} \widehat{\mathrm{Sort}} \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \lim$.

Proof. **Claim: $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \leq_{\mathbf{W}}$ Sort** We show $\max \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{Sort}$ instead and appeal to Lemma 3. Given some set $A \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{N})$, we start writing 1's, and whenever we read some $n \in A$, we write enough 0's to ensure that the current prefix has at least n 0's. If A is guaranteed to be finite, then the resulting sequence contains only finitely many 0's, and after it was sorted, we can read off how many there are – which returns $\max A$.

Claim: $\mathrm{Sort} \not\leq_{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ From Proposition 21 (2,4).

Claim: $\mathrm{Sort} \leq_{\mathbf{W}} \lim$ Given some $p \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, let $q(\langle n, i\rangle) = 0$ if $p_{\leq i}$ contains at least n 0s, and $q(\langle n, i\rangle) = 1$ otherwise. Then $\mathrm{Sort}(p) = \lim(q)$.

Claim: $\widehat{\mathrm{Sort}} \leq_{\mathbf{W}} \lim$ From $\mathrm{Sort} \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \lim$ with $\widehat{\lim} \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \lim$.

Claim: $\lim \leq_{\mathbf{W}} \widehat{\mathrm{Sort}}$ From $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{Sort}$ and $\lim \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \widehat{\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}}$.

Claim: $\mathrm{Sort} \not\leq_{\mathbf{W}} \lim$ Sort maps every input to some computable output. lim maps some computable inputs to non-computable outputs.

□

Proposition 23. 1. $\mathrm{Sort} \star \mathrm{LPO} \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{Sort} \times \mathrm{LPO}$

2. $\mathrm{Sort} \star \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{Sort} \times \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$

Proof. Note that we can extend any computable partial function $f :\subseteq \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ to a computable total function $F : \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\mathrm{Sort} \circ f(p) = \mathrm{Sort} \circ F(p)$ for any $p \in \mathrm{dom}(f)$ – just add infinitely many 1's to the (partial) output of f. Furthermore, for both cases it suffices to show the $\leq_{\mathrm{W}}$-direction, the $\geq_{\mathrm{W}}$-direction trivially holds.

1. As long as the input to LPO is consistent with $0^{\mathbb{N}}$, we use the corresponding input to Sort. If we ever read a 1 in the input to LPO, we restart writing the input to Sort corresponding to the now known output of LPO. By looking at the output of LPO (on the right hand side), we can determine in which case we are. In the former, the output of Sort already is correct. In the latter, we can find out the precise finite prefix of the input to Sort we had written when encountering the 1 in the input to LPO, count the 0s in that prefix and adjust the output of Sort accordingly.
2. We use max instead of $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$. The argument proceeds similar as above: Start by providing the input to Sort that would correspond to max outputting 0. Once we learn that max will provide a larger value, switch to the corresponding input to Sort. Repeat as required. We can then use max (on the right hand side) to determine the length of the finite wrong prefix fed to Sort, and change the output of Sort accordingly to fix it.

□

Proposition 24. $\mathrm{TC}_{\mathbb{N}} \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \star \mathrm{isFinite}_{\mathbb{S}}$ and $\mathrm{Sort} \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \star \mathrm{isInfinite}_{\mathbb{S}}$.

Proof. **First claim**: Given some $A \in \mathbb{N}$, we can compute $p_A \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $|\{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid p(k) = 1\}| \geq n$ iff $\{0, \ldots, n-1\} \cap A = \emptyset$. Apply $\mathrm{isFinite}_{\mathbb{S}}$ to this, and then $(\mathrm{id} : \mathbb{S} \to \{0,1\}) \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{LPO}$ to the output. If the answer is 1, the original input is a valid input for $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$. If we learn 0 from the first part, feed a name for $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$. The output of $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$ yields a solution to $\mathrm{TC}_{\mathbb{N}}$ in either case. Thus, $\mathrm{TC}_{\mathbb{N}} \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \star \mathrm{LPO} \star \mathrm{isFinite}_{\mathbb{S}} \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \star \mathrm{isFinite}_{\mathbb{S}}$.

Second claim: We show that $\mathrm{Sort} \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \max \star \mathrm{LPO} \star \mathrm{isInfinite}_{\mathbb{S}}$ instead. Let $S : \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ swap 0 and 1 componentwise, and let $p \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be the original input to Sort. Apply $\mathrm{id} : \mathbb{S} \to \{0,1\}$ to the output of $\mathrm{isInfinite}_{\mathbb{S}}$ on input $S(p)$. If we receive a 1, feed $0^{\mathbb{N}}$ to max, and answer $0^{\mathbb{N}}$ for Sort. Else, define $q \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ by $q(n) = |\{k \leq n \mid p(k) = 0\}|$, and note that $q \in \mathrm{dom}(\max)$. Then $0^{\max q} 1^{\omega}$ is the correct output to Sort. □

Corollary 25. $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \star \mathrm{Sort} \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \star \mathrm{isFinite}_{\mathbb{S}} \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \star \mathrm{isInfinite}_{\mathbb{S}} \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \star \mathrm{TC}_{\mathbb{N}}$

Proof. $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \star \mathbf{isInfinite}_{\mathbb{S}} \leq_{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \star \mathbf{TC}_{\mathbb{N}}$ By Proposition 21 (1).

$\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \star \mathbf{TC}_{\mathbb{N}} \leq_{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \star \mathbf{isFinite}_{\mathbb{S}}$ By Proposition 24 (1) we have $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \star \mathrm{TC}_{\mathbb{N}} \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \star \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \star \mathrm{isFinite}_{\mathbb{S}} \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \star \mathrm{isFinite}_{\mathbb{S}}$.

$\mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \star \mathbf{isFinite}_{\mathbb{S}} \leq_{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{C}_{\mathbb{N}} \star \mathrm{Sort}$ By Proposition 21 (2).

$\mathbf{C_\mathbb{N} \star \mathrm{Sort} \leq_W C_\mathbb{N} \star isInfinite_\mathbb{S}}$ By Proposition 24 (2) we have $C_\mathbb{N} \star \mathrm{Sort} \leq_W C_\mathbb{N} \star C_\mathbb{N} \star \mathrm{isIninite}_\mathbb{S} \equiv_W C_\mathbb{N} \star \mathrm{isInfinite}_\mathbb{S}$.

□

Our next goal is to show that Sort is 2-low, in the sense that $\lim \star \lim \star \mathrm{Sort} \equiv_W \lim \star \lim$. More generally, we find that:

Proposition 26. Let $g : \mathbf{X} \rightrightarrows \mathbb{N}$, and $f : \mathbf{Y} \rightrightarrows \mathbf{Z}$ where $\mathbf{Y}$ is precomplete. Then $f \star g \leq_W \widehat{f} \times g$.

Proof. Part of the input of $f \star g$ is a partial continuous function $e :\subseteq \mathbb{N} \rightrightarrows \mathbf{Y}$. As $\mathbf{Y}$ is precomplete, we can extend this to a total function, and by currying, obtain a sequence $(y_0, y_1, \ldots)$. We apply $\widehat{f}$ to that sequence, and g to the appropriate original input. Then we choose the correct component of the output of $\widehat{f}$ based on the output of g. □

Corollary 27. $\lim \star \lim \star \mathrm{Sort} \equiv_W \lim \star \lim$

Proof. From Corollary 25 we can in particular conclude that $\mathrm{Sort} \leq_W C_\mathbb{N} \star \mathrm{isInfinite}$, and the righthand side has up to isomorphism codomain $\mathbb{N}$. It is easy to see that the Weihrauch degree of lim has a representative with precomplete domain (e.g. EC). Thus we conclude $\lim \star \lim \star \mathrm{Sort} \leq_W (\lim \star \lim) \times (C_\mathbb{N} \star \mathrm{isInfinite})$ from Proposition 26. Since $\leq_W \lim \star \lim$, the claim follows. □

Corollary 28. $\coprod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathrm{Sort}^{(n)} \leq_W \lim \star \lim$.

6 The algebraic decision problem

Let $(P_{n,d})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be some standard enumeration of the d-variate polynomials with rational coefficients.

Definition 29. Define functions $\textsc{AlgDec} : \mathbb{R}^* \to [0,1]$ and $\textsc{AlgDec}_d : \mathbb{R}^d \to [0,1]$ via

$$\textsc{AlgDec}_d(x_1, \ldots, x_d) = \sum_{\{n | P_{n,d}(x_1, \ldots, x_d) = 0\}} 2^{-2n-2}$$

and $\textsc{AlgDec}(x_1, \ldots, x_m) = \textsc{AlgDec}_m(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$.

The choice for $[0,1]$ as the codomain for AlgDec is just to ease the comparison to functions computable by strongly analytic machines, we could just as well have defined $\textsc{AlgDec}_d : \mathbb{R}^d \to \{0,1\}^\mathbb{N}$ with $\textsc{AlgDec}_d((x_1, \ldots, x_d))(n) = 1$ iff $P_{n,d}(x_1, \ldots, x_d) = 0$. Thus, intuitively AlgDec will tell us the algebraic type of the input tuple.

Observation 30. If $f : \mathbb{R}^* \to \mathbb{R}^*$ is computable by a strongly analytic machine, then $f \leq_W \textsc{AlgDec}$. Moreover, AlgDec is computable by a strongly analytic machine.

Observation 31. $\textsc{AlgDec} \equiv_W \left(\coprod_{d \in \mathbb{N}} \textsc{AlgDec}_d\right)$

Proposition 32. $\textsc{AlgDec}_1 \equiv_W \mathrm{Sort}$

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{a}$ be an effective enumeration of the algebraic numbers in $\mathbb{R}$. We understand this to mean that an index n of an algebraic number a_n encodes the minimal polynomial of a_n, together with some information about which root (e.g. ordered by $<$) a_n is of its minimal polynomial. By Theorem 17 we have that $\mathrm{Sort} \equiv_W \textsc{Type}_\mathfrak{a}$, thus we only need to show $\textsc{AlgDec}_1 \equiv_W \textsc{Type}_\mathfrak{a}$.

For $\textsc{AlgDec}_1 \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \textsc{Type}_{\mathfrak{a}}$ we show that for a given rational polynomial P the predicate $P(x) = 0$ is decidable relative to $\textsc{Type}_{\mathfrak{a}}(x)$. Given a non-zero rational polynomial P, we verify in parallel if $P(x) \neq 0$ and if $\textsc{Type}_{\mathfrak{a}}(x) \neq 0$. Clearly, one of the searches has to terminate. If the second search terminates, it yields the minimal polynomial of x. Now we can decide if $P(x) = 0$ by deciding if the minimal polynomial divides P.

For $\textsc{Type}_{\mathfrak{a}} \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \textsc{AlgDec}_1$, observe that from any non-zero rational polynomial P and a real number $x \in \mathbb{R}$ with $P(x) = 0$, we can compute the minimal polynomial of x and determine the position of x in the list of its roots. □

Theorem 33. $\textsc{AlgDec}_d \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \textsc{AlgDec}^d$

Corollary 34. $\textsc{AlgDec} \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{Sort}^*$

In order to prove Theorem 33 we need to recall a few facts from (computational) commutative algebra. Let $\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{Q}[X_1, \ldots, X_d])$ denote the represented space of ideals in $\mathbb{Q}[X_1, \ldots, X_d]$, where an ideal is represented by some finite set of generators (that this is a representation follows from Hilbert's basis theorem). Recall that the *height* $\mathrm{ht}(P)$ of a prime ideal P is the length n of the longest chain of strict inclusions

$$P = P_n \supsetneq P_{n-1} \supsetneq \cdots \supsetneq P_1 \supsetneq P_0,$$

where the P_i's are prime ideals. The *Krull dimension* of a ring R is the supremum of the heights of all prime ideals in R. If K is a field, then the polynomial ring $K[X_1, \ldots, X_d]$ has Krull dimension d. We will need the following well-known facts from computer algebra (see e.g. [26, 34, 25, 16, 17])

Fact 35.

1. Membership of a polynomial $f \in \mathbb{Q}[X_1, \ldots, X_d]$ in an ideal $I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{Q}[X_1, \ldots, X_d])$ is decidable.
2. Primality of a given ideal $I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{Q}[X_1, \ldots, X_d])$ is decidable.
3. The height of a given prime ideal $P \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{Q}[X_1, \ldots, X_d])$ is computable. □

Proof of Theorem 33. The direction $\textsc{AlgDec}^d \leq_W \textsc{AlgDec}_d$ is trivial. For the converse direction we prove $\textsc{AlgDec}_d \leq_W \mathrm{Sort}^d$ and apply Proposition 32. For a given point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, consider the prime ideal $I(x) = \{f \in \mathbb{Q}[X_1, \ldots, X_d] \mid f(x) = 0\}$. Our goal is to compute the characteristic function of $I(x)$. We will use Sort^d to approximate $I(x)$ "from below" in the following sense: we will compute a sequence $(P_n)_n$ of prime ideals with $P_n \subseteq I(x)$ for all n and $P_n = I(x)$ for sufficiently large n. Using the sequence $(P_n)_n$ we can verify if $f \in I(x)$ by searching for an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f \in P_n$, using Fact 35 (i). Conversely, we can verify if $f \notin I(x)$ by verifying if $f(x) \neq 0$.

It remains to construct the sequence $(P_n)_n$. By Fact 35 we can compute for each $h \in [1; d]$ a sequence $(P_{h,n})_n$ containing all prime ideals in $\mathbb{Q}[X_1, \ldots, X_d]$ of height $\geq h$. For each of these sequences we use an instance of Sort to compute a new sequence $(P'_{h,n})_n$ with $P'_{h,n} \subseteq I(x)$, proceeding like in the proof of the reduction $\mathrm{Type}_{\mathfrak{a}} \leq_W \mathrm{Sort}$ in Theorem 17: start with $P_{h,0}$ and try to prove that $P_{h,0} \not\subseteq I(x)$ by searching for a generator f of $P_{h,0}$ with $f(x) \neq 0$. At the same time, write 1's to the input of Sort. If $P_{h,0} \not\subseteq I(x)$ is proved, write a 0 and continue with $P_{h,1}$. Apply Sort to the resulting sequence to obtain a new sequence $p \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. If $p = 0^N 1^\omega$, put

$$P'_{h,n} = \begin{cases} \langle 0 \rangle & \text{if } n \leq N, \\ P_{h,N} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If $p = 0^\omega$, put $P'_{h,n} = \langle 0 \rangle$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

By construction, each of the ideals $P'_{h,n}$ is contained in $I(x)$. If $h \leq \mathrm{ht}(I(x))$, then there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $P'_{h,n}$ has height $\geq h$. In particular, if $h = \mathrm{ht}(I(x))$, then there exists $P'_{h,n} \subseteq I(x)$ with $\mathrm{ht}(P'_{h,n}) \geq \mathrm{ht}(I(x))$. Since $P'_{h,n}$ is prime it follows that $P'_{h,n} = I(x)$. Since $\mathbb{Q}[X_1, \ldots, X_d]$ has Krull dimension d, the height $\mathrm{ht}(I(x))$ is a number between 0 and d, and if $\mathrm{ht}(I(x)) = 0$, then $I(x) = \langle 0 \rangle$, so that $P'_{h,n} = I(x)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $h \in [1; d]$. In any case, there always exist h and n such that $P'_{h,n} = I(x)$. Using standard coding tricks we may write the double-sequence $(P'_{h,n})_{h \in [1;d], n \in \mathbb{N}}$ as a single sequence $(J_n)_n$. The J_n's are a sequence of prime ideals contained in $I(x)$, at least one of which is equal to $I(x)$. Now put $P_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n} J_k$. Then $P_n \subseteq I(x)$ for all n and $P_n = I(x)$ for sufficiently large n. □

[23, Question 3.9] asks whether there is a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ which is weakly semidecidable (i.e. BSS many-one reducible to the boundedness problem for analytic machines), yet not a Π^0_3-set. We can give a negative answer:

Corollary 36. Every weakly semidecidable set is Δ^0_3.

Proof. First note that if A is BSS many-one reducible to the boundedness problem for analytic machines, then $\chi_A \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{isInfinite} \star \mathrm{Sort}^* \star \mathrm{C}_{\mathbb{N}}$. By Corollary 27, the righthand side is reducible to $\lim \star \lim$. As $\lim \star \lim$ is Σ^0_3-measurable, the claim follows. □

7 Comparing the SCI in the two models

Following [29, 1] we shall define the *solvability complexity index* over the BSS-model and over the TTE-model, and then use the results on Weihrauch degrees obtained in the preceding sections to bound their difference.

Definition 37. An n-tower for a function $f : \mathbb{R}^* \to \mathbb{R}^*$ is a function $F : \mathbb{N}^n \times \mathbb{R}^* \to \mathbb{R}^*$ such that $f(x_1, \ldots, x_m) = \lim_{i_1 \to \infty} \ldots \lim_{i_n \to \infty} F(i_1, \ldots, i_n, x_1, \ldots, x_m)$. For some function $f : \mathbb{R}^* \to \mathbb{R}^*$, let $\mathrm{SCI}_{\mathrm{BSS}}(f)$ be the least n such that there a BSS-computable n-tower for f. Let $\mathrm{SCI}_{\mathrm{TTE}}(f)$ be the least n such that there a computable (i.e. TTE-computable) n-tower for f.

Observation 38. $\mathrm{SCI}_{\mathrm{TTE}}(f) \leq n$ iff $f \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \lim^{(n)}$.

Theorem 39. If $\mathrm{SCI}_{\mathrm{TTE}}(f) \geq 2$ or $\mathrm{SCI}_{\mathrm{BSS}}(f) \geq 2$, then $\mathrm{SCI}_{\mathrm{TTE}}(f) = \mathrm{SCI}_{\mathrm{BSS}}(f)$.

Proof. **Assume $\mathbf{SCI_{TTE}}(f) = n \geq 1$.** Let $F : \mathbb{N}^n \times \mathbb{R}^* \to \mathbb{R}^*$ be a computable n-tower for f. By the Stone-Weierstrass Approximation Theorem, we can approximate F by rational polynomials on each hypercube, i.e. there are rational multivariate polynomials $g^k_{i_1,\ldots,i_n}$ such that for $(x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in [-k, k]^m$ we find that $d(g^k_{i_1,\ldots,i_n}(x_1, \ldots, x_m), F(i_1, \ldots, i_n, x_1, \ldots, x_m)) < 2^{-k}$. As we can code a computable countable sequence of rational multivariate polynomials into a computable parameter, we find that $G : \mathbb{N}^n \times \mathbb{R}^* \to \mathbb{R}^*$ defined via $G(i_1, \ldots, i_n, x_1, \ldots, x_m) = g^{i_n}_{i_1,\ldots,i_n}(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ is BSS-computable. Moreover, it is straight-forward to verify that G also is an n-tower for f. Thus, $\mathrm{SCI}_{\mathrm{TTE}}(f) \geq \mathrm{SCI}_{\mathrm{BSS}}(f)$.

Assume $\mathbf{SCI_{BSS}}(f) = n \geq 2$. Let F be a BSS-computable n-tower for f. We curry F to obtain $G : \mathbb{R}^* \to (\mathbb{R}^*)^{\mathbb{N}^n}$, and notice that with the same reasoning as for strongly analytic functions in Section 6, we find that $G \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathrm{Sort}^*$. By assumption, we then have that $f \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \lim^{(n)} \star \mathrm{Sort}^*$. As $n \geq 2$, Corollary 27 implies that already $f \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \lim^{(n)}$. As $\lim : (\mathbb{R}^*)^{\mathbb{N}^{n+1}} \to (\mathbb{R}^*)^{\mathbb{N}^n}$ is a transparent cylinder, there is a computable function H such that $f = \lim \circ \ldots \circ \lim \circ H$. But this means that H is a computable n-tower for f, i.e. $\mathrm{SCI}_{\mathrm{BSS}}(f) \geq \mathrm{SCI}_{\mathrm{TTE}}(f)$. □

Corollary 40. For $n \geq 2$, $\mathrm{SCI}_{\mathrm{BSS}}(f) \geq n$ iff $f \not\leq_{\mathrm{W}} \lim^{(n)}$.

Theorem 39 provides a formal version of the informal idea that a function that is *very non-computable* in the BSS-model is still so in the TTE-model and vice versa. This provides a reason to continue the investigation of the non-computability of an interesting function beyond establishing it – as a more precise classification can potentially be translated to the other setting via Theorem 39. This also shows that there is common ground between the two frameworks, and that this common ground includes the SCI (provided it is at least 2).

References

[1] J. Ben-Artzi, A. C. Hansen, O. Nevanlinna & M. Seidel (to appear): *Can everything be computed? – On the solvability index and towers of algorithms*. *Comptes Rendus Mathematique* Available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1508.03280`.

[2] Lenore Blum, Felipe Cucker, Michael Shub & Steve Smale (1998): *Complexity and Real Computation*. Springer.

[3] Lenore Blum, Mike Shub & Steve Smale (1989): *On a theory of computation and complexity over the real numbers: NP- completeness, recursive functions and universal machines*. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 21(1), pp. 1 – 46.

[4] Vasco Brattka (2003): *The emperors new recursiveness: The epigraph of the exponential function in two models of computability*. In: Masami Ito & Teruo Imaoka, editors: *Words, Languages & Combinatorics III*, pp. 63–72.

[5] Vasco Brattka (2005): *Effective Borel measurability and reducibility of functions*. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* 51(1), pp. 19–44.

[6] Vasco Brattka, Matthew de Brecht & Arno Pauly (2012): *Closed Choice and a Uniform Low Basis Theorem*. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 163(8), pp. 968–1008.

[7] Vasco Brattka & Guido Gherardi (2011): *Effective Choice and Boundedness Principles in Computable Analysis*. *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 1, pp. 73 – 117. ArXiv:0905.4685.

[8] Vasco Brattka & Guido Gherardi (2011): *Weihrauch Degrees, Omniscience Principles and Weak Computability*. *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 76, pp. 143 – 176. ArXiv:0905.4679.

[9] Vasco Brattka, Guido Gherardi & Rupert Hölzl (2015): *Probabilistic computability and choice*. *Information and Computation* 242, pp. 249 – 286. Available at `http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0890540115000206`. ArXiv 1312.7305.

[10] Vasco Brattka, Guido Gherardi & Alberto Marcone (2012): *The Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem is the Jump of Weak König's Lemma*. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 163(6), pp. 623–625. Also arXiv:1101.0792.

[11] Vasco Brattka & Peter Hertling (1998): *Feasible Real Random Acess Machines*. *Journal of Complexity* 14, pp. 490–526.

[12] Vasco Brattka, Stéphane Le Roux & Arno Pauly (2012): *On the Computational Content of the Brouwer Fixed Point Theorem*. In: S.Barry Cooper, Anuj Dawar & Benedikt Löwe, editors: *How the World Computes*, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 7318, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 56–67.

[13] Vasco Brattka & Arno Pauly. *On the algebraic structure of Weihrauch degrees*. forthcoming.

[14] Mark Braverman & Michael Yampolsky (2009): *Computability of Julia Sets*. Springer.

[15] Matthew de Brecht (2014): *Levels of discontinuity, limit-computability, and jump operators*. In: Vasco Brattka, Hannes Diener & Dieter Spreen, editors: *Logic, Computation, Hierarchies*, de Gruyter, pp. 79–108. ArXiv 1312.0697.

[16] Bruno Buchberger (1965): *Ein Algorithmus zum Auffinden der Basiselemente des Restklassenringes nach einem nulldimensionalen Polynomideal*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Innsbruck, Austria.

[17] Bruno Buchberger (1970): *Ein algorithmisches Kriterium für die Lösbarkeit eines algebraischen Gleichungssystems*. *Aequationes mathematicae* 4(3), pp. 374–383.

[18] Wesley Calvert, Ken Kramer & Russell Miller (2010): *The Cardinality of an Oracle in Blum-Shub-Smale Computation*. *CoRR* abs/1006.0396. Available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1006.0396`.

[19] Thomas Chadzelek & Günter Hotz (1999): *Analytic Machines*. *Theoretical Computer Science* 219, pp. 151–167.

[20] F. G. Dorais, D. D. Dzhafarov, J. L. Hirst, J. R. Mileti & P. Shafer (to appear): *On uniform relationships between combinatorial problems*. *Transactions of the AMS* ArXiv 1212.0157.

[21] Martín Escardó (2004): *Synthetic topology of datatypes and classical spaces*. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science* 87.

[22] Tobias Gärtner & Günter Hotz (2009): *Computability of Analytic Functions with Analytic Machines*. In: Klaus Ambos-Spies, Benedikt Löwe & Wolfgang Merkle, editors: *Mathematical Theory and Computational Practice*, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 5635, Springer, pp. 250–259. Available at `http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-03073-4_26`.

[23] Tobias Gärtner & Martin Ziegler (2011): *Real Analytic Machines and Degrees*. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* 7.

[24] Christine Gaßner (2008): *A Hierarchy below the Halting Problem for Additive Machines*. *Theory of Computing Systems* 43, pp. 464–470.

[25] Patrizia Gianni, Barry Trager & Gail Zacharias (1988): *Gröbner bases and primary decomposition of polynomial ideals*. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* 6(2-3).

[26] Gert-Martin Greuel & Gerhard Pfister (2007): *A Singular Introduction to Commutative Algebra*. Springer-Verlag, 2nd edition.

[27] Andrej Grzegorcyk (1955): *Computable functionals*. *Fundamenta Mathematicae* 42, pp. 168–202.

[28] Andrej Grzegorcyk (1957): *On the definition of computable real continuous functions*. *Fundamenta Mathematicae* 44, pp. 61–71.

[29] Anders C. Hansen (2011): *On the Solvability Complexity Index, the n-Pseudospectrum and Approximations of Spectra of Operators*. *Journal of the AMS* 24, pp. 81–124.

[30] Peter Hertling (1996): *Unstetigkeitsgrade von Funktionen in der effektiven Analysis*. Ph.D. thesis, Fernuniversität, Gesamthochschule in Hagen.

[31] Kojiro Higuchi & Arno Pauly (2013): *The degree-structure of Weihrauch-reducibility*. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* 9(2).

[32] Hugo de Holanda Cunha Nobrega (2013): *Game characterizations of function classes and Weihrauch degrees*. M.Sc. thesis, University of Amsterdam.

[33] G. Hotz, G. Vierke & B. Schieffer (1995): *Analytic Machines*. Technical Report 25, Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity.

[34] Michael Kalkbrener (1998): *Algorithmic Properties of Polynomial Rings*. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* 26(5), pp. 525–582.

[35] Ker-I Ko (1991): *Computational Complexity of Real Functions*. Birkhäuser.

[36] Daniel Lacombe (1955): *Extension de la notion de fonction récursive aux fonctions d'une ou plusieurs variables réelles III*. *Comptes Rendus Académie des Sciences Paris* 241, pp. 151–153.

[37] Klaus Meer & Martin Ziegler (2008): *An explicit solution to Post's Problem over the reals*. *Journal of Complexity* 24(1), pp. 3–15. Available at `http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jco.2006.09.004`.

[38] Uwe Mylatz (1992): *Vergleich unstetiger Funktionen in der Analysis*. Diplomarbeit, Fachbereich Informatik, FernUniversität Hagen.

[39] Uwe Mylatz (2006): *Vergleich unstetiger Funktionen : "Principle of Omniscience" und Vollständigkeit in der C-Hierarchie*. Ph.D. thesis, Fernuniversität, Gesamthochschule in Hagen.

[40] Arno Pauly (2007): *Methoden zum Vergleich der Unstetigkeit von Funktionen*. Masters thesis, FernUniversität Hagen.

[41] Arno Pauly (2009). *Infinite Oracle Queries in Type-2 Machines (Extended Abstract)*. arXiv:0907.3230v1.

[42] Arno Pauly (2010): *How Incomputable is Finding Nash Equilibria?* *Journal of Universal Computer Science* 16(18), pp. 2686–2710.

[43] Arno Pauly (2010): *On the (semi)lattices induced by continuous reducibilities*. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* 56(5), pp. 488–502.

[44] Arno Pauly (2015). *Computability on the countable ordinals and the Hausdorff-Kuratowski theorem*. arXiv 1501.00386.

[45] Arno Pauly (201X): *On the topological aspects of the theory of represented spaces*. *Computability* Accepted for publication, available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1204.3763.

[46] Arno Pauly & Matthew de Brecht (2014): *Non-deterministic Computation and the Jayne Rogers Theorem*. *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science* 143. DCM 2012.

[47] Arno Pauly, George Davie & Willem Fouché (2015). *Weihrauch-completeness for layerwise computability*. arXiv:1505.02091.

[48] Arno Pauly & Florian Steinberg (2015). *Representations of analytic functions and Weihrauch degrees*. http://arxiv.org/abs/1512.03024.

[49] Roger Penrose (1989): *The emperor's new mind*. Oxford University Press.

[50] Marian Pour-El & Ian Richards (1989): *Computability in analysis and physics*. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer.

[51] Tahina Rakotoniaina (2015): *On the Computational Strength of Ramsey's Theorem*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Cape Town.

[52] Nazanin Tavana & Klaus Weihrauch (2011): *Turing machines on represented sets, a model of computation for analysis*. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* 7, pp. 1–21.

[53] J.V. Tucker & J.I. Zucker (2000): *Computable functions and semicomputable sets on many-sorted algebras*. In: T.S.E. Maybaum S. Abramsky, D.M. Gabbay, editor: *Handbook of Logic in Computer Science*, *Oxford Science Publications* 5, pp. 317–523.

[54] Klaus Weihrauch (1987): *Computability*. Monographs on Theoretical Computer Science. Springer-Verlag.

[55] Klaus Weihrauch (2000): *Computable Analysis*. Springer-Verlag.

[56] Martin Ziegler (2007): *Real Computability and Hypercomputation*. Habilitationsschrift, University of Paderborn.

[57] Martin Ziegler (2007): *Real Hypercomputation and Continuity*. *Theory of Computing Systems* 41, pp. 177 – 206.

[58] Martin Ziegler (2007): *Revising Type-2 Computation and Degrees of Discontinuity*. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science* 167, pp. 255–274.

Acknowledgements

This work was inspired by discussions at the workshop *Real Computation and BSS Complexity* in Greifswald, and the second author would like to thank the participants Russell Miller, Tobias Gärtner and Martin Ziegler, as well as the organizer Christine Gaßner. Moreover, the second

author would like to thank Anders Hansen for fruitful discussions on the solvability complexity index.

The work presented here benefited from the Royal Society International Exchange Grant IE111233. The second author is partially supported by the ERC inVest project.